

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 26, 2008 the Office noted that claims 1-12 were pending and rejected claims 1-12. Claims 1-12 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claim 13 is added, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-13 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The disclosure stands objected to for introducing new matter. In particular, the Office states that the claim 2 recites "said titles and notifications and the inputted text and titles appear as single linear text in at least one text zone" which is not supported by the Specification.

In ¶ 0206 of the printed publication version of the Specification, it is stated "[d]uring step 808, in at least one text zone, the titles defined by the standard and the text input by the user appear, like a single linear text, to be shown in the second to the seventh tables above." Thus, the Applicant submits that the Specification does contain support for claim 2 and therefore no new matter was added as asserted by the Office.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office asserts "said titles and notifications and the inputted text and titles appear as single linear text in at least one text zone," is not supported by the Specification.

The Applicant submits for the reasons discussed above, claim 2 is properly described in the Specification.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office asserts that the term "defining a document standard" is unclear. Specifically, the Office asserts that a standard must always be pre-existing. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Under the logic espoused by the Office, no new standard could ever be introduced as all standards must be pre-existing.

The claim recites "**defining** a document standard." (Emphasis added). Thus, the claim recites defining a new standard or a standard for a document which is being produced. In the context of the claim, defining a document standard defines the content and the form of the document. This is made clear, for example, in ¶¶ 0060-0096 and 0205 of the printed publication version of the Specification.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular the Office asserts that the claimed device of claim 12 is only software. MPEP 2601(IV)(B)(2)(a) states "If a claim defines a useful machine or manufacture by identifying the physical structure of the machine or manufacture in terms of its hardware or hardware and software combination, it defines a statutory product. See, e.g., *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583, 32 USPQ2d at 1034-35; *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361-62, 31 USPQ2d at 1760." Thus, the Applicant has amended the claim to recite "a computer programmed with software comprising means ...." A computer defines hardware, which is a physical structure. Thus, the claim identifies both hardware and software and is therefore statutory.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 7-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over McCaskey, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152245 in view of Dedrick, U.S. Patent No. 5,717,923. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

McCaskey discusses methods for publishing press

articles and images on the Web to produce an electronic newspaper. The recipient of the information does not participate with the journalist in the establishment of a document standard.

Dedrick discusses a method for dynamic personalization of information for end users, namely consumers, so that information is selected and can be adapted to their individual requirements and their particular characteristics. However, unlike the present claims the end user does not collaborate in the production of the document.

On page 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that McCaskey ¶¶ 0083-0087 disclose "defining a document standard determining a general framework of the document."

However, McCasky as cited, merely defines the format news data is displayed in, not a document standard. Such a document standard carries content as well as format and therefore is not disclosed by plain HTML or web page templates of McCaskey.

The Office does not assert and the Applicant has not found that Dedrick discloses such a feature.

On page 6 of the Office Action, it is asserted that McCaskey, ¶¶ 0064; 0081; 0087; 0091; and 0120 disclose "inputting, by said first user, said information, the step of inputting being comprised of inputting text and/or titles to the general framework and selecting values authorized on said fields," as in claim 1.

However, while the cited paragraphs discuss format and

style tags and codes associated with different fields, such features are not "values authorized on said fields." For example, McCaskey, ¶ 0120 states in part "[t]hese style tags and codes were previously interspersed in the story text by software the writer or an editor uses in order to direct the story's placement and formatting in its printed newspaper form." Thus, nothing as cited in McCaskey discloses selecting values authorized on said fields.

The Office does not assert and the Applicant has not found that Dedrick discloses such a feature.

On pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that McCaskey does not disclose "values authorized by fields of information, the step of defining being performed by said first user and the second user, said first user producing the information, the second user receiving at least a portion of the information," as in claim 1, but asserts that Dedrick, col. 4, lines 24-65; col. 14, lines 13-32; and col. 13, lines 29-46 does.

However, Dedrick, merely discusses how a user consumes information. For example, Dedrick, col. 4, lines 49-55 states

For example, an advertiser 18 may create an advertisement for a camera which **describes the camera in both audio and video format. Both of these consumption formats are transferred to the metering servers 14, and subsequently to the client systems 12.** The end user is then able to consume the advertisement **in whichever format he or she prefers, or alternatively in both formats.** [Emphasis added]

Thus, in Dedrick, the second user does not define the

information; he or she simply determines how it is consumed.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that McCaskey does not disclose "selecting, by each secondary user, a sorting criterion based on the titles or the fields of the document set by the step of defining a document standard," as in claim 1, but asserts that Dedrick, col. 8, lines 20-55 does.

The Applicant acknowledges that Dedrick does disclose searching for a particular product such as a camera (i.e. search criteria). However, this is not to be confused with a sorting criterion, which is the order in which data returned based on the search criteria is presented. Dedrick is completely silent as to sorting or sorting criteria. McCaskey as well is silent as to such a sorting criterion.

For the same reason as above, "re-organizing the document according to said sorting criterion," as in claim 1 is not disclosed.

On page 6 and 8 the Office acknowledges that McCaskey does not disclose "each second user defines an identical document standard, and wherein each second user selects a separate sorting criterion corresponding to each second user independent from another second user," as in claim 1, but asserts that Dedrick, col. 4, lines 24-65 and col. 8, lines 38-66 does.

However, as discussed above, the Applicant acknowledges that Dedrick disclose a search criterion, there is no sorting criterion disclosed. Further, Dedrick does not disclose that

each second user defines an identical document standard. Dedrick, like McCaskey, merely describes an output format, not the content of the document.

Claim 12 disclose similar features as claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, McCaskey and Dedrick, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 1 and 12 and the claims dependent therefrom.

As regards claim 2, McCaskey and Dedrick fail to disclose "said titles and notifications and the inputted text and titles appear as single linear text in at least one text zone, during the step of inputting and the step of supplying. Neither reference discloses the data as a single linear text.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over McCaskey in view of Dedrick in further view of Miyasaka, U.S. Patent No. 6,766,362. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Miyasaka a computer network for supplying a personalized newspaper to a recipient according to the preferences stored in a user profile. However, there is no collaboration between the producer and the recipient of the newspaper.

Like Dedrick, Miyasaka only discusses a search criteria, not a sorting criteria as required by the claims.

Miyasaka adds nothing to the combination of McCaskey and Dedrick as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, McCaskey, Dedrick and Miyasaka, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 5 and 6.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### NEW CLAIMS

Claim 13 is new. Support for claim 13 may be found, for example, in ¶ 0213 of the printed publication version of the Specification. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the inclusion of claim 13. The prior art of record fails to disclose the second user modifies the content of the document to give it added value.

#### SUMMARY


It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 103 and 112. It is also submitted that claims 1-13 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.



The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



---

James J. Livingston, Jr.  
Reg. No. 55,394  
209 Madison St, Suite 500  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb